

A.) Objection to the drawings:

FIGs. 1 and 2 have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

B.) Objection to the specification for informalities:

The specification has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 1-5 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art by applicant in view of *Jung*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's independent claim 1 claims a semiconductor device having first and second gate electrodes 2, 3 provided on first and second element formation regions 4, 5. (See FIG. 3).

A first impurity region 7 has one end connected to the first gate electrode 2 and is arranged in a direction different from the direction of the first and second gate electrodes 2, 3. A second impurity region 8 has one end connected to the second gate electrode 3, and the other end electrically connected to the other end of the first impurity region 7. The second impurity region 8 is also arranged in a direction different from the first and second gate electrodes 2, 3.

Applicant's present invention inventively reduces chip area while providing for extended regions (7, 8) that suitably function as sources of stored impurities.

This is clearly unlike either Applicant's admitted prior art and *Jung*, taken singly or in combination.

As discussed in the specification, Applicant's admitted prior art merely discloses linear gate electrodes 101, 102 which meet at a common point. Unlike Applicants' claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art fails to disclose first and second impurity regions that are arranged in directions different from the first and second gate electrodes 101, 102. Applicant's admitted prior art is disadvantageously limited in that its gate electrodes must be of sufficient length to function as sources of stored impurities.

Jung also fails to disclose first and second impurity regions that are arranged in directions different from first and second gate electrodes. In fact *Jung* fails to disclose first and second gate electrodes. *Jung* merely discloses one common gate electrode 120 that is shared by two element formation regions 10, 20. (See FIG. 3). Nowhere does *Jung* disclose or suggest that 1) its single gate electrode can be separated into two different gate electrodes, or 2) that first and second impurity regions can be connected to ends of the gate electrodes and arranged in different directions from the gate electrodes.

Also, similar to Applicant's admitted prior art, *Jung* specifically teaches away from Applicant's claim 1 in that it discloses a single, common gate electrode. Similar to Applicant's admitted prior art, the *Jung* electrode must have a sufficient linear length to function as a source of stored impurities. This clearly teaches away from Applicants' claim 1 and merely discloses what is known in Applicant's admitted prior art.

The Examiner argues that *Jung* discloses multiple gate electrodes and impurity regions connected to the gate electrodes. Applicant respectfully disagrees and directs the Examiner's attention to *Jung*'s common gate electrode 120 having no impurity regions connected thereto. (FIG. 3).

Therefore, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of *Jung* fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's independent claim 1.

Claims 2-5 and 9-11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art as modified by *Jung*, and further in view of *Joyner et al.*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's independent claim 1 is allowable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of *Jung* as discussed above. *Joyner et al.* still fails to disclose or suggest first and second impurity regions that are arranged in directions different from first and second gate electrodes. *Joyner et al.* merely discloses first and second gate electrodes 26 that do not have impurity regions attached thereto. Similar to Applicant's admitted prior art and *Jung*, *Joyner et al.* fails to provide for extended regions that suitably function as sources of stored impurities. Therefore, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of *Jung*, and further in view of *Joyner et al.* still fails to

disclose or suggest Applicant's claim 1.

Claims 6-8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Asst. Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on January 12, 2001.

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch